

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2009-10**

**MASSACHUSETTS**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013~~3~~4, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005~~5~~6, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2009-10 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614	
Expiration Date: 10/31/2010	
<p style="text-align: center;">Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Massachusetts	
Address: 75 Pleasant St. Malden, MA 02148	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Robert Curtin	
Telephone: 781-338-3582	
Fax: 781-338-6850	
e-mail: rcurtin@doe.mass.edu	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mitchell D. Chester	
_____ Signature	
_____ Friday, April 29, 2011, 5:43:13 PM	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

### STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

#### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education currently has academic content standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. These can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/current.html>. The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics on July 21, 2010, with the expectation that schools and districts will align their curricula by the end of the 2011-2012 school year. Public comment on any proposed additional standards or features is currently being solicited through December 1, 2010. The review of the current state Science standards began in spring 2009 and is expected to continue through spring 2012.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts and/or science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned.
--

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.



**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	50.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	50.0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	<u>      </u> Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	<u>      </u> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<u>      </u> Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	<u>      </u> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<u>      </u> Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>      </u> No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<u>      </u> No
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	<u>      </u> Yes
Other	<u>      </u> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENT

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *ESEA*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	505,455		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,283		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	27,072	26,156	96.6
Black, non-Hispanic	41,281	39,864	96.6
Hispanic	72,759	70,161	96.4
White, non-Hispanic	351,932		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	91,355		>97
Limited English proficient ( <i>LEP</i> ) students	31,502	27,121	86.1
Economically disadvantaged students	173,792		>97
Migratory students	26		>97
Male	259,606		>97
Female	245,704		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,635	10.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	71,477	79.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	158	<3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,674	9.6
Total	89,944	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	505,233		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,279		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	26,999		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	41,174		>97
Hispanic	72,765		>97
White, non-Hispanic	351,884		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	91,454		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,149		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	173,731		>97
Migratory students	27		>97
Male	259,521		>97
Female	245,542		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	9,868	11.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	71,532	79.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	99	<3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	8,569	9.5
Total	90,068	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	266,893		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	710		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,852	13,396	96.7
Black, non-Hispanic	22,975	22,114	96.3
Hispanic	38,320	36,608	95.5
White, non-Hispanic	185,740		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	46,749		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	13,704	11,483	83.8
Economically disadvantaged students	89,633	86,412	96.4
Migratory students	N<20	N<20	
Male	136,765		>97
Female	130,036		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	11,096	24.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	31,158	68.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	34	<3
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	N<20	
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	3,223	7.1
Total	45,511	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State assessments.

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	70,552	45,994	65.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	158	79	50.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,079	3,149	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,482	2,187	39.9
Hispanic	10,592	4,422	41.7
White, non-Hispanic	48,211	34,907	72.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,517	3,827	30.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,871	2,150	36.6
Economically disadvantaged students	25,130	11,382	45.3
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,283	23,599	65.0
Female	34,243	22,386	65.4
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	71,116	44,412	62.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	79	49.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,174	2,737	65.6
Black, non-Hispanic	5,599	2,283	40.8
Hispanic	10,882	4,021	37.0
White, non-Hispanic	48,282	34,019	70.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,550	3,199	25.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,394	1,597	25.0
Economically disadvantaged students	25,591	10,727	41.9
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,546	21,332	58.4
Female	34,549	23,074	66.8
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Massachusetts does not administer a science exam in grade three.			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	70,924	33,900	47.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	152	62	40.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,957	2,563	64.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,492	1,349	24.6
Hispanic	10,553	2,834	26.9
White, non-Hispanic	49,000	26,276	53.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,097	2,093	16.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,492	1,240	22.6
Economically disadvantaged students	24,957	7,086	28.4
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,499	17,205	47.1
Female	34,400	16,686	48.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	71,393	37,969	53.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	149	67	45.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	4,072	2,518	61.8
Black, non-Hispanic	5,596	1,629	29.1
Hispanic	10,793	2,928	27.1
White, non-Hispanic	49,015	29,917	61.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,094	2,060	15.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,996	1,066	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	25,364	7,574	29.9
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,747	17,451	47.5
Female	34,625	20,512	59.2
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			



**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Massachusetts does not administer a science test in grade four.			

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	70,946	38,755	54.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	74	40.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,602	2,629	73.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,687	1,746	30.7
Hispanic	10,294	3,045	29.6
White, non-Hispanic	49,576	30,426	61.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,159	2,378	18.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,264	939	22.0
Economically disadvantaged students	24,620	8,087	32.8
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,327	19,887	54.7
Female	34,605	18,866	54.5
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	71,440	44,617	62.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	97	52.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,701	2,563	69.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,792	2,306	39.8
Hispanic	10,507	3,786	36.0
White, non-Hispanic	49,645	34,873	70.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,212	2,959	22.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,710	912	19.4
Economically disadvantaged students	25,039	10,080	40.3
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,586	21,023	57.5
Female	34,837	23,584	67.7
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

## 1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	#Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,931	37,581	53.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	65	35.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,600	2,213	61.5
Black, non-Hispanic	5,694	1,311	23.0
Hispanic	10,325	2,519	24.4
White, non-Hispanic	49,528	30,644	61.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,152	2,763	21.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,294	503	11.7
Economically disadvantaged students	24,642	7,028	28.5
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,311	19,736	54.4
Female	34,607	17,842	51.6
Comments: The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,177	42,584	59.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	79	46.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,629	2,844	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,818	2,016	34.7
Hispanic	10,210	3,463	33.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,825	33,327	65.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,628	2,630	19.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,467	775	22.4
Economically disadvantaged students	24,815	9,266	37.3
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	37,121	21,656	58.3
Female	35,037	20,924	59.7
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,604	50,314	69.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	168	98	58.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,712	2,871	77.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,906	2,779	47.1
Hispanic	10,402	4,587	44.1
White, non-Hispanic	50,882	38,941	76.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,640	3,841	28.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,879	823	21.2
Economically disadvantaged students	25,173	12,090	48.0
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	37,322	23,839	63.9
Female	35,250	26,466	75.1
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Massachusetts does not administer a science exam in grade six.			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	71,452	38,124	53.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	87	38.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,639	2,669	73.3
Black, non-Hispanic	5,739	1,676	29.2
Hispanic	9,827	2,648	26.9
White, non-Hispanic	50,531	30,270	59.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,219	1,983	15.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,903	430	14.8
Economically disadvantaged students	24,169	7,578	31.4
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,654	19,167	52.3
Female	34,783	18,953	54.5
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	71,858	51,554	71.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	227	141	62.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,715	2,897	78.0
Black, non-Hispanic	5,848	3,005	51.4
Hispanic	10,019	4,612	46.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,553	39,842	78.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	13,212	3,903	29.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,390	588	17.3
Economically disadvantaged students	24,523	12,384	50.5
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,876	24,405	66.2
Female	34,958	27,134	77.6
<b>Comments:</b> The data are accurate and have been verified.			

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Massachusetts does not administer a science exam in grade seven.			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,180	37,182	51.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	70	37.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,690	2,710	73.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,841	1,656	28.4
Hispanic	9,750	2,495	25.6
White, non-Hispanic	51,349	29,588	57.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,827	1,627	12.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,750	376	13.7
Economically disadvantaged students	23,903	7,121	29.8
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	37,146	19,016	51.2
Female	35,014	18,164	51.9
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are accurate.			

**1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,758	55,997	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	191	126	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,793	3,118	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	5,944	3,461	58.2
Hispanic	10,035	5,356	53.4
White, non-Hispanic	51,419	42,868	83.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,884	4,674	36.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,251	641	19.7
Economically disadvantaged students	24,420	14,256	58.4
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	37,460	27,210	72.6
Female	35,265	28,766	81.6
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are accurate.			



**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	72,026	28,577	39.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	51	27.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,683	1,942	52.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5,809	745	12.8
Hispanic	9,714	1,243	12.8
White, non-Hispanic	51,273	24,067	46.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,757	1,312	10.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,730	97	3.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,805	4,088	17.2
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	37,057	15,651	42.2
Female	34,950	12,925	37.0
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are accurate.			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,401	53,052	75.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	120	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,560	3,065	86.1
Black, non-Hispanic	5,805	3,095	53.3
Hispanic	8,935	4,429	49.6
White, non-Hispanic	50,673	41,468	81.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,497	4,183	36.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,374	693	29.2
Economically disadvantaged students	21,366	12,063	56.5
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	35,778	26,800	74.9
Female	34,604	26,244	75.8
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are accurate.			

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,924	55,122	77.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	188	133	70.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,649	2,860	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5,985	3,515	58.7
Hispanic	9,140	4,934	54.0
White, non-Hispanic	50,721	42,742	84.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,476	4,373	38.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,868	444	15.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,811	12,796	58.7
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	36,040	26,554	73.7
Female	34,867	28,559	81.9
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are accurate.			

## 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science- High School

High School	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	#Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	119,341	74,966	62.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	324	161	49.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,113	4,405	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	10,611	3,638	34.3
Hispanic	16,569	5,011	30.2
White, non-Hispanic	83,466	60,433	72.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	19,602	5,066	25.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,459	601	13.5
Economically disadvantaged students	37,965	14,300	37.7
Migratory students	N<20		
Male	60,768	38,227	62.9
Female	58,517	36,728	62.8
Comments: The data have been verified and are accurate.			

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,716	575	33.5
Districts	385	69	17.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	992	259	26.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	486	74	15.2
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	506	185	36.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
368	56	15.2
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	52
Extension of the school year or school day	25
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	16
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	18
Replacement of the principal	6
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	40
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	27
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	17
Reopening the school as a public charter school	1
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	2
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	219
<b>Comments:</b> There were no schools that were taken over by the state.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1. A senior level administrator provided frequent school based supervision. 2. Small learning communities with administrative oversight were established. 3. Grade level teams with administrative oversight were established. 4. Ongoing professional development via the coaching model was provided in the areas of writing, guided reading, assessment and data driven instruction, and embedding science and social studies into the ELA block.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

##### Measures Being Taken to Address Achievement Problems

To address achievement problems in Massachusetts' districts, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) utilizes two workgroups: Urban District Assistance (UDA), provides support to the 10 large urbans known as the Commissioner's Districts which are identified for improvement or corrective action and have 42 Title I schools, and the District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) serve districts that have 73 Title I schools. Both UDA and the DSACs comprise the state's Regional System of Support and address the needs of districts that fall at Levels 3 (DSACs) and 4 (UDA) in the state's new accountability framework.

##### Targeted Assistance to 10 High-Needs Urban Districts

In fall 2009, ESE continued with its approach of assigning liaisons (full-time staff in UDA) to work with each of the Commissioner's Districts. With these ten districts—Boston, Brockton, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, New Bedford, Springfield, Worcester—Memoranda of Understanding were developed in a collaborative effort involving district and UDA staff to detail key assistance efforts that would be undertaken. UDA staff then worked from these MOUs and from ongoing discussions with district leadership to 1) provide direct assistance related to systems, structures, and improvement efforts; 2) access content-area specialists and other ESE staff to provide similar support through on-site work in districts; and 3) support efforts through grant funding targeted at district and school improvement.

Each 'liaison' from UDA—a Director, Manager, or Education Specialist D staff member—was assigned a subset of the 10 districts, some of which had been working with the same liaison(s) in prior year(s) and, thus, developing strong professional relationships. Liaisons were charged with building capacity at the district level in order to support schools. Capacity-building endeavors included 1) maintaining an Urban Superintendents' Network for disseminating ESE information and resources and networking leaders in districts facing some of the same challenges; 2) establishing a Thought-Partnership across three superintendents, with facilitation and ESE involvement, so that a smaller group of three leaders from the Commissioner's Districts could network around specific strategy decisions; 3) setting up conference calls and meetings in which ESE content-area specialists could connect with district lead-staff for math, ELA, ELE, special education, and more; 4) accessing district and school improvement funding; 5) providing periodic check-ins related to grant spend-downs and fiscal accountability; and 6) maintaining open lines of communication around ESE's accountability framework, around requirements and opportunities for districts and schools at Level 4 (which are required to submit turnaround plans for identified schools), and around addressing needs at both district and school levels.

In prior years, UDA provided direct assistance and participation in observations used by districts to determine what was taking place in classrooms, in professional learning communities, and in data teams. In 2009-10, that work continued in many of the Commissioner's Districts and received ongoing support from UDA—with UDA also coordinating support from other offices at ESE. At the same time, UDA formalized some its processes related to these observations, and published them as resource guides and toolkits for use in the districts. These served as assistance in the form of tools/documents, (including a Learning Walkthrough Toolkit, CPT and PLC resources, and a District Data Team Toolkit), and work was done in several districts by liaisons to familiarize staff with the tools and help structure their roll-out and scale-up at district/school sites.

##### Regionally-Based Targeted Assistance

In fall 2009, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education established six regional District and School Assistance Centers to assist districts and their schools in strategically accessing and using professional development and targeted assistance to improve instruction and raise achievement for all students. The DSACs give first priority for assistance to Level 3 districts, as outlined in the ESE Framework for District Accountability and Assistance. In 2009-2010, Level 3 districts included all districts in corrective action and/or districts with schools in corrective action or restructuring under NCLB.

Each DSAC is led by a Regional Assistance Director, a recently retired superintendent, who works with a small assistance team of a former principal, a data specialist, a mathematics specialist, and a literacy specialist. The DSAC teams collaborate with districts to assess their strengths and needs and then facilitate access to effective strategies, resources, and professional development, establish partnerships and networks, and deliver individualized assistance for the region's districts. The DSAC teams work with districts and their schools to strengthen and improve schools in accordance with schools' strategic plans.

During the first year of operation, 2009-10, examples of DSAC assistance included:

- Access to high quality professional development in literacy, mathematics, instructional leadership, sheltered content for English language learners, and inclusive practices for students with disabilities;
- Assistance with self-assessments to target areas of greatest need and support for improvement planning at the school and district level;
- Training on and modeling the use of tools for Learning Walkthroughs, building effective use of common planning time, and using data for district-level strategic decisions;
- Networks for superintendents, principals, mathematics and literacy leaders, coaches, and/or teachers to share and learn about effective practices; and
- Data reporting, analysis, and data use training to support district self-assessment and evaluation.

Title I eligible Level 3 districts received FY10 Title I School Improvement Grant funds to use to support the participation of teachers and leaders from Title I schools in NCLB status in professional development and DSAC-provided and other targeted assistance efforts aligned with their School Improvement Plans.

##### Evaluating Effectiveness

Two evaluations were commissioned by ESE at the end of the 2009-10 school year to evaluate the effectiveness of technical assistance



provided through the Regional System of Support. UMass Donahue Institute conducted a study on both Urban District Assistance and the DSACs, utilizing interviews and document reviews to share a snapshot of the effectiveness of activity undertaken by these two workgroups in 2009-10. Less formal evaluative measures, such as discussions between the Associate Commissioner leading the Center for Targeted Assistance and district leadership, also took place on a regular basis to evaluate the effectiveness of the year's activities. Results of these conversations about the perceptions of effectiveness were coupled with quantitative and other data on school and district performance to arrive at conclusions about outcomes of the 2009-10 school year's efforts.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	4	0
Schools	14	7
<b>Comments:</b>		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	12/07/10
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	131,743	130,110
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	55,356	50,954
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	42.0	39.2
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	131,949	129,825
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	69,339	66,121
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	52.5	50.9
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress
- Exited improvement status
- Did not make adequate yearly progress

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	43
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	20

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10
Comments:

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies) identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
2	Observation strategies and protocols, data collection and analysis processes, team building and support, and other research-based strategies learned through direct PD, documents and published tools, modeling, and collaborative participation in key processes by ESE through UDA and DSACs combined	116	22	0	A	
3	Networking through Urban Superintendents' Network (USN) around strategies, information, and protocols for use by central office leadership. Utilizing thought-partnering techniques and related strategies across superintendents in three of the Commissioner's Districts (a subset of the USN districts)—Brockton, Lowell, and Worcester—in sessions set up and joined by ESE and facilitated by an external consultant.	52	9	1	A	
4	Specific content, instructional, or procedural strategies disseminated through District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) on topics such as Learning Walkthroughs, data analysis, and ELE strategies	73	17	3	A	
<b>Comments:</b>						

## Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school

staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

- 2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
- 4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESE shared effective strategies described in item 1.4.8.3 with districts through staff members specifically assigned to liaison roles. Urban District Assistance liaisons were charged with much of the strategy dissemination to the Commissioner's Districts. The DSAC's leadership at ESE, as well as regional staff (see 1.4.8.3), assumed responsibility for sharing strategies with other districts and schools. Both groups of ESE representatives used site-visits, phonecalls, emails, and other written communications for strategy dissemination, and they were also involved in some of the direct service provision (such as participation in initiatives, modeling, and training). They also shared strategies via published documentation, including ESE's Learning Walkthrough Toolkit, District Data Team Toolkit, PLC Guidance, and CPT Self-Assessment. In addition, new tools such as ESE's District Analysis and Review Tool (DART) were created to provide districts with information on where they stood in relation to other LEAs—for example, districts with similar demographics but more favorable student growth results. Tools such as the DART helped districts gain insights into which strategies were serving them well, and which were not. Liaisons and DSAC representatives provided introductions and assistance with using those tools, and reflected on both their use and on the results they communicated.

Regular networking activities undertaken by ESE also provided means of sharing information on effective strategies. A standard Urban Superintendents' Network list-serve was used to get information out to those in the group, and monthly meetings provided opportunities to dig deeply into that information through presentations from ESE, facilitated discussions, cross-district sharing, small-group work, and follow-up. Additional networks, such as the Math Support Specialist Network and Literacy Network, were also used for strategy dissemination across professionals in like roles from different districts.

Commissioner's updates and ESE website announcements also were used to prompt districts' investigation into certain strategies. Then, follow-up through networks, liaison contact, use of tools, and direct assistance from ESE specialists allowed districts and schools to investigate those strategies in greater depth.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds****1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0%

**Comments:**

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.



#### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

##### Technical Assistance:

June/July 2010

Pre-application webinar: Redesign Plan Overview; Scoring Rubric Overview

Pre-application webinar: Implementation Timeline and Benchmarks

Measurable Annual Goals

Pre-application webinar: Budget Workbook

Pre-application Conference Call: Final opportunity for questions and answers

Expanded Learning Time, Phase I Workshop

##### Evaluation:

August 2010

##### External Facilitation of Grant Review Evaluation Process

##### Training and Review Team Members

The composition of the review team included 16 staff members from ESE, 7 external review team members with expertise in district and school improvement efforts, and 1 representative from the Executive Office of Education. Review team members participated in a half-day training on July 26, 2010 to review the scoring rubric, the federal requirements, and to develop a joint understanding of the expectations for submitted Redesign Plans. All materials and guidance provided by ESE and referenced in this document can be found online at:

##### Consensus Team Scoring

A consensus team scoring process was used to review submitted plans. The review process began on Thursday, July 29, 2010 with the joint scoring of two of the 16 submitted proposals, in order to calibrate reviewers' understanding of rubric items and scoring and to model the consensus scoring approach. Approximately half of the reviewers (n=13) read, reviewed, and scored one of the submitted proposals and the remaining (n=12) reviewers read and jointly scored a second proposal. A "fishbowl" facilitation technique was used for a portion of the joint scoring process, to allow individuals to observe the team scoring process in action.

The team scoring process involved teams with at least 3 members reading, reviewing and spending between 2 to 5 hours together to develop a consensus team score for a single plan. A scoring rubric was used to score each portion of the redesign plan. To the extent possible, teams were comprised of ESE staff members and an external reviewer, with attention given to having a mix of individuals with specific content and grade-level expertise relevant to the Redesign Plan under review. Review Teams generated a team score for their assigned Redesign Plan, a set of comments, and suggested interview questions, to be used as reference during the School Interview portion of the process, if needed.

##### Calibration

Upon review of the scores generated during the Team Scoring process, it was decided that certain items required additional calibration and adjustment, as needed to ensure the reliability of scores across Redesign Plans and to ensure that team scores were comparable. Calibration among Boston's school proposals was necessary due to the use of common language across proposals. Additionally, ratings for item A14 in the rubric were adjusted to account for an inconsistency in the rubric language. The adjusted scores did not alter the final outcome of the review process.

##### Interviews

Proposals that received an initial score of 76 or higher were invited to participate in an interview, with the exception of the four (4) Boston Public Schools (BPS) proposals that received a score of 90 or higher during the Team Scoring process. Interviews for Fall River, Springfield, and Chelsea included district and school representatives and were held on August 3, 2010. Because BPS submitted applications for 10 schools, a separate interview for the BPS Central Office was scheduled, followed by individual school interviews, which also included participation by a district official. The BPS interview and five of the six school interviews were held on August 4, 2010. The sixth BPS school was interviewed on August 5, 2010. The one-hour interview process included a set of standard school and district questions used in each interview, followed by school-specific questions addressing programmatic and technical issues of a school's proposed intervention model, including questions related to the budget. The ESE interview team was comprised of four individuals: Mr. Lane, Mr. Chuang, Lynda Foisy, Associate Commissioner for the Center for Targeted Assistance, Division for Accountability, Partnerships, and Assistance, and a member of the Review Team that reviewed the school Redesign Plan. An interview rubric was used to score the interview session. Additionally, the ESE interview team asked questions and listened for evidence in the following categories:

**Sustainability:** The ability of the district/school interview team to describe how proposed strategies will contribute to long-term improvement and long-term plans for how specific interventions/strategies (such as extended learning time) may be sustained and funded after three years.

**Transformative:** The extent to which the proposed intervention model contained strategies, approaches, and practices that represented transformative, in contrast to incremental, improvement efforts.

Substantive Changes: The depth of changes and strategies proposed in the Redesign Plan, such as changes in staffing, compelling evidence that the leadership used its power to recruit new staff, or evidence of dramatic changes in school practices (e.g., changing the structure of the school schedule, using a new model or approach to instruction, or infusing technology across the school).

Evidence of Strategic Thinking: Evidence that the district/school interview team had fully thought through the rationale for proposed strategies and could articulate precisely how different structure and strategies would work together to improve the school (e.g., exactly how common planning time would be used, the content of the discussion in such meetings, and how administrators would monitor teacher talk in common planning time).

Ownership of Plan by Team: Evidence that the district/school interview team, and school staff as a whole, owned the plan and were able to discuss various aspects of the plan.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Actions taken by Massachusetts in SY2009-10 that were supported by funds other than Sections 1003(a) and 1003(g) included ensuring adequate ESE staff coverage to address districts' needs. State targeted assistance dollars paid for some of the DSAC staff time, for mileage reimbursement for UDA staff members so that they could travel on a regular basis to and from districts, and for a portion of the funding that the Commissioner's Districts received as part of Memoranda of Understanding with UDA. State dollars also provided some additional support in the form of assistance grants awarded by UDA.

**1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.1 Public School Choice**

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

**1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students**

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	349,459
Applied to transfer	1,389
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	688
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,737,651

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice.
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	156

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

**Comments:**

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	163,926
Applied for supplemental educational services	12,631
Received supplemental educational services	10,220
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 10,534,366
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of *ESEA*.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	280,489	272,827	97.3	7,662	2.7
All elementary classes	194,725	190,333	97.7	4,392	2.3
All secondary classes	85,764	82,494	96.2	3,270	3.8

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Massachusetts uses a departmentalized approach self-contained elementary classrooms are weighted by a factor of five.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.



**1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified**

In the tables below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	39.3
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	10.3
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	50.4
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The "Other" option was used because the ESE does not collect alternative route program information through our Education Personnel Information Management System, which is the source of the data above. Therefore, the data represented in "Other" are those teachers who are not fully certified, but their alternative program status is unknown.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	33.4
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	10.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	56.6
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Same as above.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	49,510	47,519	96.0
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	50,828	49,872	98.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	15,751	14,692	93.3
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	21,346	20,804	97.5
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

**1.5.3.1** In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	57.9	8.1
Poverty metric used	free and reduced price lunch percentage.	
Secondary schools	55.8	11.3
Poverty metric used	free and reduced price lunch percentage.	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language\\_Instruction\\_Educational\\_Programs.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Dual language	Spanish, Portuguese
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Two-way immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Developmental bilingual	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Heritage language	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Structured English immersion	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Content-based ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> No	Pull-out ESL	
<input type="checkbox"/> No Response	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data****1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	58,174
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	44,166
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	31,008
Portuguese	4,119
Chinese	3,141
Creoles and pidgins, Portuguese-based (Other)	2,531
Haitian; Haitian Creole	2,476

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

**1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	54,287
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,887
Total	58,174
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are accurate.	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	20,821
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	35.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	41,500
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,666
Total	44,166
<b>Comments:</b> 753 students had IEPs requiring an Alternate assessment, Braille, ASL or some other form of accommodation not available.  69 had medically documented absences.  88 Transferred during the testing window and weren't tested.  2 were invalidated due to cheating or test administration improprieties.  431 were tested in Reading and Writing but did not submit speaking or listening scores..  229 did not take the writing ,but participated in the reading and MELA O.  61 did not take reading but did take writing and MELA O.  The remainder, missed two or more sections of the test without a valid excuse. Some may have been reporting errors, but we can't quantify those.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	8,701

**1.6.3.2.2****Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	25,279	77.1	20,026	61.00
Attained proficiency	18,238	43.9	14,540	35.00
<b>Comments:</b>				







**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
4,699	4,476	9,175
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,634	4,035	46.7	4,599
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,650	4,598	53.2	4,052
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,513	1,015	28.9	2,498
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	55
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	36
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	38
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	2
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	13
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	38
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	30

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Per the amendment to the state plan approved on March 14, 2011, although at least one consortium was awarded a Title III grant in the 2009-2010 school year, Massachusetts for the first time this school year has established a formal process under which consortia may apply for Title III grants. The consortium that applied in 2009-2010 did not reapply, and therefore, Massachusetts has not to date awarded Title III funds to any consortia for two consecutive years. Calculation of AMAOs for consortia applicants will be treated as follows:

AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 will be calculated for the consortia as a single entity, due to minimum group size requirements.  
AMAO 3 will be calculated for each LEA that is a member district of a consortium as a separate entity, provided the LEA's LEP subgroup meets minimum group size requirements.

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>      </u> No
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>      </u> No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
18,951		11

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data have been verified and are accurate.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) ð The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course ð (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English as a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,214
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	500

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	47	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	50	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	43	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	47	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	50	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	52	12,838
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers		
PD provided to principals	0	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	0	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	0	0
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	52	12,838

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The amount of professional development provided to LEP classroom teachers can not be provided at this time.

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/7/09	8/7/09	30
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the budget approval process this fiscal year (FY2011), ESE staff continued to engage in significant dialogue with LEAs concerning Title III grant submissions prior to approval of grants. Following last year's grant cycle, the Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement (OELAAA), in conjunction with our liaison from the federal level, held an in-person technical assistance session for LEAs in April 2010 concerning Title III requirements. A follow-up webinar for LEAs was held in June 2010 with our federal liaison. The purpose of these sessions was to enable districts to better understand Title III requirements. Topics included:

- Supplement not supplant requirements.
- Private school outreach.
- Cap on administrative costs.

ESE held a conference call in August 2010 for new Title III grantees. Additional conference calls were held in September 2010 for any grantee who wished to participate (these were scheduled when it appeared that some grantees were submitting applications that were not compliant with Title III requirements).

As a result of the 2010-11 grant cycle thus far, ESE has determined that districts continue to require technical assistance in order to improve and expedite the application process for Title III funds. The Department intends to offer further technical assistance sessions in the spring 2010.

OELAAA this year began implementation of a provisional approval process. Districts may receive provisional approval and access Title III funds while other requirements are satisfied. A short timeline is given to districts, based on individual LEA circumstances, in order to complete additional requirements.

ESE intends to continue the provisional approval process as well as implement the following efforts:

- Post preliminary LEA allocations (once received from the federal government) and permit districts to apply for Title III grants prior to summer vacation.
- Explore changes to the budget workbook in the new grants management system.
- Offer several TA sessions in the spring 2010, including at the annual Massachusetts Association of Teachers of Other Languages conference, which many ELL directors attend. TA sessions will continue to be focused on issues which prevented immediate approval in FY 2010-11 grants.

ESE is also adopting a new grant management system agency-wide. The Title III office will work to determine whether any changes can be made within this new system to decrease approval time.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments:</b> The answer for Massachusetts is zero. Per the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Education, we are writing the answer in this comment box since it is not showing above.	



## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	
Asian or Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	64.9
Limited English proficient	57.5
Economically disadvantaged	66.9
Migratory students	
Male	78.6
Female	84.6
<b>Comments:</b> There are no data entered for the racial groups listed above because Massachusetts calculates graduation rate data for the new OMB specifications of seven race/ethnicity categories. The most recent data for Massachusetts can be found at: <a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/reports/gradrates/">www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/reports/gradrates/</a> .	

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the *No Child Left Behind Act* on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:
  - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
  - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
  - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	5.6
Hispanic	7.5
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5.0
Limited English proficient	8.5
Economically disadvantaged	5.0
Migratory students	
Male	3.4
Female	<3
<b>Comments:</b>	

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney- Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	369	369
LEAs with subgrants	23	23
Total	392	392
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)**

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	61	245
K	247	836
1	294	860
2	247	807
3	269	795
4	220	773
5	211	720
6	182	705
7	227	645
8	248	748
9	339	866
10	295	611
11	289	529
12	365	443
Ungraded	N<20	N<20
Total	3,501	9,589
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	1,507	3,788
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,496	4,779
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	29	55
Hotels/Motels	469	967
Total	3,501	9,589
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	241
K	900
1	887
2	793
3	798
4	777
5	714
6	683
7	662
8	774
9	894
10	616
11	533
12	456
Ungraded	N<20
Total	9,734
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	369
Migratory children/youth	N<20
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,548
Limited English proficient students	2,457
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	14
Expedited evaluations	11
Staff professional development and awareness	21
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	15
Transportation	16
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	15
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	22
Coordination between schools and agencies	18
Counseling	12
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	15
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	19
Referral to other programs and services	16
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	4

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *ESEA* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *ESEA*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	299	85
4	301	41
5	326	88
6	383	129
7	500	138
8	689	239
High School	688	262
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *ESEA* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	306	91
4	308	42
5	317	53
6	379	84
7	509	67
8	673	68
High School	687	215
<b>Comments:</b>		

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them under Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note:** In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

### FAQs on Child Count:

*a. How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

*b. How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)



**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	86
K	31
1	N<20
2	N<20
3	N<20
4	N<20
5	N<20
6	N<20
7	N<20
8	N<20
9	N<20
10	N<20
11	N<20
12	N<20
Ungraded	N<20
Out-of-school	210
Total	403
<b>Comments:</b> The data have been verified and are correct.	

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

!There are no increases or decreases greater than ten percent.

---

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	44
K	21
1	N<20
2	N<20
3	N<20
4	N<20
5	N<20
6	N<20
7	N<20
8	N<20
9	N<20
10	N<20
11	N<20
12	N<20
Ungraded	N<20
Out-of-school	52
Total	149
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

There were no increases or decreases greater than ten percent.

---

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Massachusetts used a proprietary student information system to compile the Category 1 and Category 2 Counts. This system was developed exclusively for the Massachusetts Migrant Education Program using FileMaker Pro software. 2008-09 child counts were generated using the same system.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The identification and recruitment of migrant children is the primary role of Community Liaisons and is conducted twelve months a year. The Community Liaisons make the initial direct contact with the potentially eligible migrant family, obtain eligibility information, and have the primary responsibility for the determination and documentation of student eligibility.

Day-to-day supervision of the Community Liaisons and implementation of identification and recruitment efforts are the responsibility of the Massachusetts Migrant Education Program's (MMEP) three Regional Directors, who are, in turn assisted by a team leader, or "verifier" who helps with the verification of all paperwork submitted. Primary responsibility for system planning, policy, and interstate/intrastate coordination is assigned to the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator who is directly supervised by the State Director. Through this structure, the identification and recruitment component provides for regional supervision and coordination of identification and recruitment (Community Liaisons) while maintaining a centralized planning and monitoring system designed to ensure strict compliance with federal student eligibility requirements.

When potentially eligible migrant families have been located, the Community Liaisons ascertain eligibility through structured face-to-face interviews with the parents or guardians or with the out of school youth. When recruiting in urban centers for families who have ceased to migrate but remain eligible for program services, Community Liaisons must assess the validity of the information gathered. This assessment may include contacting employers, referring to attrition rate study, and contacting community-based social service agencies. Once eligibility is determined, Community Liaisons complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and submit it for review and verification by the Regional Director and his/her "verifier." This documentation is reviewed once again by the ID & R Coordinator who both validates the paperwork with desk audits and face-to face interviews of families and/or OSY who have been declared eligible.

At the point of identification, the Community Liaisons are required to recognize the family as being "new", "adding additional children" who joined the family after the LQM, or "enrolled previously". Between September and November each year, Community Liaisons interview every active eligible family during a face-to-face meeting to recheck and update the information on the COE.

The Community Liaisons are required to complete paper COE data sections on family (ethnicity, home language, father's last name, mother's last name, current address, current telephone number, school district), child[ren] (name, sex, birth date, school, grade, special services) and qualifying eligibility (date children moved from last city and date they arrived in current city, who they moved with or joined), in the case of an emancipated youth, (all information mentioned above and the date they moved and arrived is noted) who is doing temporary or seasonal agricultural or fishing activity, date employment was sought or obtained, name of employer), and other clarifying information.

Community Liaisons are required to complete a data section on the standard COE on "Previous Qualifying Move(s), Activities, Address (es)". This provides information in addition to the LQM --- not only to substantiate the eligibility and to document residency, but also to identify families who may have made a migrant move within the Commonwealth and across programmatic Regions. This measure and other verification and validation measures are implemented to preclude the duplication of a family in the program's database.

The Pupil Records Coordinator searches "family last name and first"; "similar name"; "English cognates"; "addresses and telephone numbers". Then the Pupil Records Coordinator searches "student names"; "birth dates"; and "parents names". If the Pupil Records Coordinator finds a single match, she then "pulls" the COE from the file drawer, reviews it, and checks the signatures.

After determining the Category 1 child count, the data for the Category 2 child count is collected by looking at all students who received services after the last day of the regular school year and before the first day of the new school year. These data contained in this Report refers to activities documented between September 1, 2009 and August 31, 2010.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All eligible families/students/youth are enrolled in the migrant program's principal state database at one centralized location by the MMEP Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the data directly from validated COEs.

Before the Pupil Records Coordinator assigns the unique family and unique child numbers, a search is conducted utilizing the mother's name, the names and dates of birth of the children, and a review of all records under the same last name. No new family can be enrolled into the database without this screen for duplicates. The data system that we use has a built-in capacity to use "wildcards" for single pieces of data: The discovery of a single variable, which matches a child or family, signals to the Pupil Records Coordinator that she must pull the COE and examine the information contained in it and all of the signatures. In this way, duplication of a family/child is prevented.

If the search is negative, the new family is enrolled and a unique family number and a unique student number are assigned by the Pupil Records Coordinator. Although the program's database can be accessed by regional staff for generating reports, the system restricts the regional staff from having the ability to enroll families/students or update eligibility information.

The Student Database consists of a collection of discrete records. Using the relational capacity of the system, it is able to track an infinite number of educational service experiences while maintaining a single unique record for each student. Student service data are collected and entered into the student enrollment record by regional staff. During the school year and summer, Records Clerks gather the service data and enter it into an Enrollment Database, which is related to the Student Database.

The MMEP administrative staff and records staff have worked with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE - formerly Department of Education) to develop a memorandum of understanding to allow MMEP access to education data collected by DESE. This data, including SIMS (Student Information Management System data), MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System data) and MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment), is integrated into the MMEP student data system for purpose of informing operational decision making, completing and confirming demographic data and to contribute to the pool of data for MSIX (Migrant Student Records Exchange Initiative).

In addition, information is collected and entered into the database on all academic services that a student receives at the summer project site or through home-based services. The student information is forwarded from the Support Center to the Record Clerks located in each Regional Office. The Record Clerks enter enrollment and attendance information into the enrollment database, a separate and distinct relational database.

Two distinct databases -a "student database" and an "enrollment database"- are included in the Support Center's data warehouse. The student database has been organized to ensure that there is only one record per student. The enrollment database, a related database, is used to characterize each incidence of education service. The records in the enrollment database are used to "flag" the student records for inclusion in the Category 2 child count. The student database is searched for records that meet eligibility criteria, including eligibility for service for at least one day during summer of the report year by LQM; age-eligible; a check that the student has not been terminated before the beginning of that summer; and that the student has not turned three or has confirmation of residency after turning three during the report year. The student database is the primary generator of student counts which ensure the "uniqueness" of each record, thereby avoiding duplication of student records in the counts.

The student database is the source for all student service data presented in reports such as OME's Category 1 and Category 2 Report. Within the student database only a single record exists for each student regardless of the number of services a student receives and despite the possibility of a student being served by more than one Massachusetts Migrant Education Program Region. In this database, an individual student cannot be counted more than once.

When migrant child counts are requested by local, state or federal sources, the Pupil Records Coordinator conditions the query to the student database to access the information needed. As an example, when Massachusetts needed to generate information for this Migrant Child Count Report (School Year 2009 - 2010), the Pupil Records Coordinator first queried the system for all eligible children between the ages of 3 and 21 who had not graduated from high school, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who resided in Massachusetts between September 1, 2009 and August 31, 2010. An unduplicated count of 375 Category 1 migrant children was generated from that query. The Pupil Records Coordinator then queried the system for the count of all eligible children between the ages of 3 - 21, within three years of making a qualifying move, and who received MEP-funded services between the last day of the 2009 - 2010 school year and before the first day of the 2010 - 2011 school year and who had not graduated from high school. An unduplicated count of 149 Category 2 migrant children was generated from that query. When an eligible migrant student graduates from high school, the Community Liaison completes a "Change of Status Form" which is then forwarded to the Pupil Records Coordinator who enters the student as now being "inactive" and who enters the student's graduation date as the "termination date". Queries on the student database for Category 1 and 2 counts include an elaborate screening process. This process prevents the inclusion of three-year-olds whose residency has not been documented (after they turn three) or their termination date from the program. Additional screening prevents children at any age from being included in the count if their residency status has not been documented.

Community Liaisons are alerted by the Records Clerks in advance of the date that potential Category 1 migrant children will turn three. Community Liaisons are asked to visit the family and to update the COE as soon as possible to document residency of all eligible children.

The MMEP Regional Offices, on an on-going basis, provide migrant student lists to all LEAs who are serving migrant students. These lists "flag" the eligible migrant students to assist the LEAs to plan appropriate support for those students and to facilitate the sharing of education information by the school and MMEP region.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

See above.

**1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children**

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- Children who were between age 3 through 21;
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- Children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 Count: The Massachusetts Migrant Education Program's student database has a built-in calculation for the expiration of eligibility. To verify the accuracy of the database, on a daily basis the Pupil Records Coordinator does a "find" of active students between the ages of three through twenty-one who had not graduated from high school. If discrepancies are discovered, the Pupil Records Coordinator reviews the COEs and consults the Community Liaisons, the Records Clerks, and/or the Regional Director for a determination of eligibility on those students. All children turning three during the report period are tested for confirmation of residency after their third birthday---a face-to-face or telephone confirmation must be documented before the child's information is entered into a relational database. The same system is used for all other migrant students. For a student to be included in the twelve-month count, each one of the conditions mentioned above must be satisfied.

Category 2 Count: For a student to be included in the Category 2 count, the conditions mentioned above must be met along with one additional criterion --- that service has been provided through MEP funds (and documented in a related database) after the last day of the 2009 - 2010 school year ended and before the 2010 -2011 school year began.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

See above.



#### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The quality control system in place during the 2009 - 2010 program year consisted of four phases and involved at least two individuals who shared responsibility for the review and monitoring of eligibility determinations. That system is described below:

Phase One: Quality control began with quality training. Each year Community Liaisons are required to attend (a) training sessions which review technical guides/reports, federal guidelines regarding eligibility, the state Identification and Recruitment Manual and (b) additional training in interviewing techniques, information on welfare reform, education reform, access to social and human services, CHIPS information, and other information that impacts migrant families. In 2008 the MMEP program sponsored workshops on recruitment strategies and practices which were presented by the Migrant Education Resource Center (MERC) to all MMEP staff. In 2009 and 2010 MMEP conducted Statewide Identification and Recruitment training which was mandated for all staff. (c) Each year Community Liaisons and Recruiters are required to pass a competency test in order to demonstrate requisite knowledge of all ID & R procedures and eligibility guidelines. Newly hired Community Liaisons must participate in an intensive orientation and demonstrate competency through an examination prior to working on their own.

Phase Two: Community Liaisons submit the completed COEs to their Regional Director. All COEs are reviewed by the Regional Directors to determine if the eligibility determination was correct and creditable and that the COE was accurate and complete. To facilitate the verification process, the Regional Directors updated information on the major agricultural and fishing activities within their Region on a routine basis. If there are questions about information on COEs, the COEs are returned to the Community Liaisons for correction or further explanation.

Phase Three: Regional Directors submit their COEs to the Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Coordinator. All COEs are validated by the ID&R Coordinator to authorize student enrollment into the migrant program's student database. The review at this stage ensures that the eligibility of children considered to be migratory was properly documented and verified and that the eligibility data was creditable. If there were questions about information on the COEs, the COEs were returned to the Regional Directors for correction or further explanation.

Phase Four: The final quality control process--auditing--is done by the ID&R Coordinator on a "pre-enrollment" basis. During this phase, on a random sample basis, COEs of each Community Liaison are "field audited" (by telephone, letter, a home visit, a public school visit, and/or an employer visit) to ensure that both the identification and recruitment and information management systems are functioning properly. The ID&R Coordinator reviewed all questionable COEs with the MMEP State Director. It was the State Director who, in these rare cases, is the final arbitrator and determines whether the family/children are migratory and should be enrolled in the MMEP's student database.

In addition, in September, 2009, the MMEP implemented the National COE and trained all staff in its use.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As stated elsewhere in this report, every COE is reviewed at the regional office and verified by the regional director whose signature on the second page of the form indicates that to the best of his/her knowledge the information is accurate. Within 5-10 days of receipt of a regionally verified COE at the Migrant Support Center, the Identification and Recruitment Coordinator would visit the residence or place of employment of the identified migrant in order to conduct a re-interview.

For the report period of September 1, 2009 to August 31, 2010, 43% of statewide verified Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) were subject to a re-interview procedure to ensure a high level of quality control prior to their entry into the database.

All re-interview sessions are attended by the Community Liaison/Recruiter and ID&R Coordinator. In the course of a re-interview session every item recorded on the eligibility section of the COE and the Emancipated Youth's age is reviewed for consistency and accuracy.

If the information on the COE is found to be consistent and accurate by the re-interviewing authority, the positive result of the re-interview session is noted on an independent form (Basic Interviewing Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form). If the information on the COE is found to be inconsistent with the re-interview and/or found to be inaccurate, the COE would be rejected and the family deemed ineligible for services under Migrant Education and the family is notified that they are ineligible for services. For those cases in which the COE is rejected, the ID&R Coordinator follows-up with the Community Liaison and Recruiter to clarify any potential misunderstandings about eligibility guidelines.

A quality control sheet (Basic Interview Pattern for Determining Eligibility Form) is used to record the results of the audit (re-interview) visit. This quality control form is completed by the ID&R Coordinator, then attached and filed with the original COE.

Number of eligibility determinations sampled 56  
Number for which a test was completed 56

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator (a single person acting at the State level), follows a protocol of "pulling" COEs on a random sample basis to review and verify the information in the Student Database against the COE; when entering information from the COE Update Forms into the Database, spot checks are implemented, such as a review of family and child unique numbers, and other data that has already been entered into the database; and on a daily basis manual confirmation on the eligibility expiration date of all students is completed. In addition, at the MMEP Regional Offices, the Records Clerks are also reviewing COE data against COE "update data" for accuracy on an on-going basis.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The final steps taken by the Pupil Records Coordinator are (1) to audit a sample of student records and pull the COEs to confirm the eligibility through an examination of the "hard copy" documentation and (2) through the system's built-in programs of "finds" and "sorts", to try to replicate the student counts by using different methodologies. All summer services provided to eligible students through MEP-funding is provided by the MMEP. Information that is reviewed throughout the year is contained in the COEs and in the MMEP permission forms.

The standard procedure for identifying the records to be included in the count relies on calculation fields in the student database which flag records that meet specific criteria via boolean operations on data in fields from the student database as well as fields from other related databases. For example one of the set of flag fields used in executing the Category 1 eligibility count, marks a record if the child's LQM was within three years of the beginning of the report period and if a termination date for that child exists, only if the termination occurred after the beginning of the report period. One strategy used to check the accuracy of that flag is to find all student records with an LQM that falls within the acceptable range for the report year. This group of records is then sorted using the flag field as well as the termination date field and any irregularities can be observed by examining each record.

Although this process seems cumbersome, the sort accelerates the process. There will be a series of records, which represent active students with no termination date and, if the flag is observed to be behaving properly, these records may be dispensed with rather quickly. Similarly those records having termination dates after the beginning of the report period should also be flagged and this can rapidly be confirmed. The remaining records should not be flagged and should represent records with termination dates prior to the beginning of the report period. Due to the sort order, the borders for each series are predictable and can be readily identified. Those records in proximity to the borders may be examined more carefully for irregularities, such as unexpected flags or absence of flags. After the found set is satisfactorily examined the omitted records are sorted and examined similarly. Any flagged records in this set would indicate the existence of false positives in which an LQM would be outside of the acceptable three-year range. This is just one example of how a series of finds and sorts combined with scanning of individual records are used to confirm the validity of the compiled data.

Twice per month throughout the year, the Pupil Records Coordinator generates a child count report and submits it to the State Director. This report is reviewed by the State Director and the Regional Directors and compared against previous child counts and recruitment targets.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As a result of Massachusetts' statewide re-interviewing initiative in 2006, the MMEP has taken steps to refine and improve upon the quality control exercised over the recruitment and identification of eligible migrant students. The revised framework for monitoring the accuracy of our work is detailed below.

Briefly described, the new framework introduces an additional layer of oversight during the work of recruiting eligible migrant children. Instead of leaving quality control exclusively in the hands of the MMEP Support Center, each region will now call upon "verifiers" to assist in the process. Verifiers will review the paperwork of the COE, confer with Regional Directors, and then together sign off on the accuracy and thoroughness of the COEs being submitted to the Support Center. The objective here, in addition, to having an extra set of "eyes" to review the paperwork is to proactively identify any potential errors and/or misidentified families well before they are declared eligible. In so doing, verifiers will also free additional time for Support Center personnel to conduct more face-to-face re-interviews of families. The need for more face-to-face re-interviews was one of the recommendations to surface in the Statewide Director's Re-interviewing Report to OME in 2006.

The flow chart outlined in the "Conceptual Framework" calls for CLs to submit their COEs to a verifier who will then use MMEPs existing standards for quality control to check the COEs for accuracy. In addition to making use of these standards, Verifiers will also complete the Regional COE Verification Form, attaching it to the COE, once reviewed. Finally, after conferring with CLs, as needed, verifiers will then confer once again with the Regional Directors before he/she signs off on the COE and sends it to the Support Center.

COEs submitted by the Regional Directors will then undergo a process of "validation" by the ID& R Coordinator and staff at the Support Center. Validation activities will, among other things, consist of telephone checks of schools and employers, and face-to-face re-interviews on a systematic basis throughout each school year. In the event that a COE and/or family is discovered to be ineligible for service, Support Staff will send a MMEP Failure to Validate Form" (and other documents) back to the Regional Director and Verifier, informing them of the change in status. MMEP continues to strengthen the comprehensive quality control training program launched in 2007. Components include Statewide training for recruiters, community liaisons and regional staff; Supplemental training by MERC (Migrant Education Resource Center), an annual competency exam for Community Liaisons, and systematic administrative review of all Identification and Recruitment policies and procedures.

---

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts nor the underlying eligibility determinations upon which the counts are based.